

SPEECH

OF

32

HON. CHAS. E. CLARKE, OF NEW YORK,

ON THE

ADMISSION OF CALIFORNIA.

DELIVERED

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 13, 1850.

---

WASHINGTON:  
PRINTED AT THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE OFFICE.  
1850.

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2018 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries



## ADMISSION OF CALIFORNIA.

---

In Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, on the President's Message transmitting the Constitution of California.

Mr. CLARKE said:

The magnitude of the question under debate, the decision of which is to determine whether an immense territory shall have slavery ingrafted on it, involving, perhaps, the integrity, and certainly the welfare of the Republic, deserves a full discussion. But when we consider the wide range that debate has taken, and that in our remarks we are limited to a single hour, we are constrained to avoid all elaboration of ideas, sternly to exclude all flowers of rhetoric, and all those ornaments of language in which it is the pleasure of some to indulge.

On the present Congress devolves the great task of determining the boundaries of Texas, the admission or rejection of California as a State, and of providing, if need there be, for the government of the remaining territory which we have lately acquired—all of which could be easily accomplished in a month, were it not that the eternal question of slavery meets us at every step, and, like the plagues of Egypt, besets our path with reptiles, and threatens to becloud our mental vision with darkness so thick that it may be felt.

In the discussion of this great question—a question of more importance than has ever before engaged the attention of this country, except the question whether these United States should be free and independent—it is our duty to bear in mind that the wealth, power, virtue, and happiness of a country, depend upon its being well governed; that it is for the immense territories which we have acquired, and for their welfare, mainly, that we are legislating; that our course should be parental, marked with forecast and humanity, and that all sectional or party strife and supremacy is nothing—less than nothing—in comparison with the wealth, power, virtue, and happiness of the immense territory for which we are

about to make laws; that in the discharge of that duty, as in the discharge of all duties, while we owe allegiance to the Constitution, we also owe obedience and devotion to a power higher and holier than any earthly tribunal; that while the former compels us to do our duty as legislators and statesmen, the latter induces us to bear ourselves as men bound by moral and religious obligations. Happily, our glorious Constitution does not contravene the promptings of humanity, philanthropy, and religion.

It has been to the advocates of freedom a source of deep regret that there should be any seeming difference of opinion, even as to the mode of obtaining a just result.

The hosts of freedom are not so numerous or so strong, that they can afford to divide. There is work enough for all to do, responsibility enough for us all to encounter, and glory enough, if the event be fortunate, for us all to share. It was therefore extremely humiliating at the commencement of this session, that our organization should be delayed a month by some of those who claim to be the exclusive friends of human liberty.

Such an organization as the claims of the Whig party, the necessities of the country, and the cause of freedom required, could have been effected by those who are most clamorous in the cause of freedom.

But it has been the fate of the party to which I allude—it has been the doom of the country—that clamoring loudest and longest against the extension of slavery, and often holding the balance of power, so waywardly to use that power as to bring signal defeat on its own darling measure, and to afford most efficient aid to the men and the measures it claimed to oppose. That party could have prevented the annexation of Texas, with its 325,520 square miles of slave territory; but it thought proper to throw away its votes in a presidential election, and the result was, as it was predicted, that Texas was annexed.



The representatives of that party, the perfectionists in this House, threw away their votes in the choice of Speaker, and the consequence was, as everybody foresaw, that we have, what this party claimed most to dread, a southern Speaker, a gentleman interested in and devoted to the peculiar institutions of the South. When, by the wayward efforts of this party, a slaveholding Speaker is chosen, and the committees appointed of such tinge and character as everybody knew they would be, a leader in that party, with wonderful nimbleness, proposes to instruct the Committee on Territories.

By a prudent and discreet use of the votes of this party, the committees might have been so constituted that they would have needed no instructions; but it seemed the pleasure and policy of that party to create the difficulty and danger, and then to manifest marvelous alacrity in arresting the mischief it had done; to bore full of holes the bottom of the good ship that carried freedom and her fortunes, and then to claim merit of the country for the nimbleness with which they whittled plugs to stop the holes they had bored; and if, notwithstanding their wayward efforts, the good ship should come safely into port, these perfectionists will no doubt put in their claim for a double share of salvage.

I shall consider first the constitutional power of this Government to exclude slavery from the territories; and, coming to the conclusion that it is constitutional, shall consider the expediency of the measure; and, if time permits, say a few words in reply to the manifold and vituperative charges which certain orators on this floor prefer against the North.

The constitutional right to exclude slavery from all territory of the United States may be predicated on the 3d section of article 4th of the Constitution:

"Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting, the territory or other property of the United States."

The reply to this is, that the framers of the Constitution could have had no reference to any other territory than that which we owned at the time of making the Constitution, and therefore the power does not exist as to territory acquired since.

This is a dangerous construction for the South; and, if true, all those States which have been admitted into this Union from territory acquired since the adoption of the Constitution, were unconstitutionally admitted, and all the slave representation from those States predicated on the three-fifth rule, is unconstitutional also. For if the framers of the Constitution did not refer to territory hereafter to be acquired, they could not have referred to States to be made out of that territory.

It is equally clear, that if the Constitution did not contemplate the extension of territory beyond the precincts of the United States, it did not contemplate the admission of States beyond those boundaries; and, by a parity of reasoning, it could not have contemplated that any slave representation should have grown up beyond those boundaries.

If, as is alleged, the power to make needful rules and regulations respecting territories is restricted to the territories we then owned, then the three-fifths rule must be restricted also.

If this construction is to prevail, all the slave representation on this floor from States made out of Louisiana, Florida, or Texas, is unconstitutional, and that slave property has no more right to be represented here than cotton mills, ships, or cattle; and, by the same construction, the free States are not bound to deliver up slaves that escape from States formed out of the new territories. In short, if Congress has no power to exclude slavery from the territories acquired since the adoption of the Constitution, it has no power to give a slave representation to States formed out of that territory; neither can it exact of the free States to deliver up slaves that escape from those States. Acting under this clause of the Constitution, Congress did exclude slavery from all territory lying north of the Ohio river.

Gentlemen say this was a compromise. Assume that it was a compromise: no compromise can add to or detract from the constitutionality of a law. That Congress which enacted the law excluding slavery from the territories north of the Ohio river, knew the power of that Constitution which many of its members had shortly before aided in making, as well as we; they were as good judges, as honest, and had not yet bewildered themselves in the mazes of metaphysical sophistry. Again: in article first, section nine, of the Constitution, Congress is expressly denied the power of prohibiting the migration or importation of such slaves as any of the then existing States should think proper to admit till the year 1808. This inhibition is what logicians call a negative pregnant; it implies most forcibly that the power *did* exist to prohibit the migration or importation of slaves, and this ninth section was intended to restrain the exercise of that power till 1808. Congress, at any time after the adoption of the Constitution, had the power to inhibit the introduction of slaves into its territories, and into States that did not exist at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. The power extends not only to the importation, which means from Africa or other foreign parts, but it extends also to the migration, which means the moving, as I understand it, from State to State or Territory.



The State of Tennessee once formed a part of the State of North Carolina. When North Carolina consented that that portion of her territory should be detached, and formed into a separate State, she coupled that consent with a condition that Congress should pass no laws prohibiting the State of North Carolina from selling her slaves to the people of Tennessee. Clearly showing that the good old North State entertained the opinion that Congress had the power to prohibit the slave trade between the States. Acting under this power, Congress, in 1804, prohibited the introduction of all slaves into the then territory of Louisiana, unless owned by a citizen of the United States, and removed by him, in good faith, for the purpose of actual settlement in that territory.

This ninth section clearly indicates, that after the year 1808, Congress had the power to restrain the migration or importation of slaves. Congress immediately applied the power. In 1794, Congress prohibited the exportation of slaves; in 1803, another law, prohibiting the introduction of slaves into certain States; in 1807, another law prohibiting the introduction of slaves from Africa or other foreign ports. In 1820, Congress passed a law declaring it *piracy* to seize any negro on any foreign shore, or to decoy any negro on board any ship, with intent to enslave him; and prescribed the punishment of death on the offender.

Congress, then, has exercised the power of prohibiting the exportation of slaves to foreign parts, and of prohibiting their introduction in the States against the will of the States—for nearly fifty years has assumed to prohibit exportation or migration of slaves. These laws have been acquiesced in; and it is clear, that for at least fifty years it has been understood that Congress had power to prohibit the slave trade.

Under this power in the Constitution Congress has totally prohibited the introduction of slaves north of the Missouri compromise line; Congress has exercised the power within the boundaries and without the boundaries of the old United States. What principle prevents a similar exercise of power as to California or New Mexico?

The power to exclude slavery from the new territories exists under both the treaty and the war-making power. Congress has the power to declare war, and that implies the power to acquire territory by conquest.

The power to make treaties implies the power to buy territory. Territory thus acquired, whether by treaty or conquest, may be inhabited or not. Sovereignty and ownership combined, give the power to exclude or admit inhabitants, and to govern the territory acquired. Besides, Congress

has power to make all laws necessary and proper to carry into execution any powers vested in the Government. The power to acquire territory is vested in the Government, the right and the duty to govern is necessarily vested, and of course the power to exclude slavery.

Again: Congress has power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, among the several States, and with the Indian tribes." The active word is *regulate*, and it acts on the word commerce, alike, whether carried on with foreign nations, or between the States, or with the Indian tribes. Under this power we enact embargo laws, indefinite in their duration and unlimited in their extent, destroying all commerce with foreign nations.

We prohibit trade in certain articles with the Indian tribes; we prohibit the dealer in intoxicating liquors—the vender of "fire water"—from carrying his property to the red men of the forest. Whiskey is no more property than slaves—the dealing in either is commerce.

If, then, Congress has power to prohibit commerce with foreign nations and with the Indian tribes, can it not prohibit the commerce between the several States in slaves? But it is alleged that the law to interdict commerce in slaves with California or New Mexico, is not *general*, and therefore unconstitutional. The answer to this is, that the law in its terms is general; it says to all the world that slaves shall not be carried into those territories, and that though the action of this law may be partial it is none the less constitutional.

The *embargo* was a general and a constitutional law, although it was extremely partial in its effects. That law confined our ships to our harbors and cut off our commerce with all the world; still its operation was almost exclusively on the Atlantic States.

Over conquered territory the power of the conqueror is absolute as to its commerce. The same is true of territory acquired by treaty, unless restrained by the treaty itself; the conqueror takes all public property, and, if he chooses, he liberates and arms the slaves.

In the territories lately acquired, the United States not only has absolute sovereignty, but is to a great extent the owner of the soil; and every squatter, every man who has cut a tree or dug an ounce of gold, is legally responsible to the owner of the soil. Whenever sovereignty and ownership are combined, cannot the sovereign and owner decide who shall come on his land, and what they shall bring with them?

This power has been conceded and acted upon for half a century, and it would seem was settled,



if there be any such thing as settling any political question.

Having demonstrated the constitutional right to acquire territory, and that the right to acquire implies the right to govern,—having also demonstrated that we have a right to regulate commerce between the several States, and that that right extends to commerce in slaves,—having shown that sovereignty over the territory, especially combined with ownership of the soil, implies the right to govern and the mode and manner of using it,—having proved that Congress has exercised this power undoubted and acquiesced in for half a century,—I dismiss that portion of my subject.

Is it expedient to exclude slavery from California and New Mexico?

In discussing this part of the subject, it is our duty to inquire as well for the future as for the present, and to bear in mind, that, however short and ephemeral the life of man may be, a nation never dies.

Upon the result of our deliberations depends in no small degree the virtue, the happiness, the strength, the glory of the great territory for which we are legislating, for ages to come. I believe that it is essential to man that he should be industrious. I deem it necessary to the development as well of his mental as of his physical powers; and I further believe, that it is a blessing to man that the earth does not minister spontaneously to his wants.

The power of a nation depends on the numbers, physical strength, skill, science, and moral culture of its inhabitants.

An equal number of white American citizens are more powerful than an equal number of the people of any other nation, for the reason that they have equal physical strength, and far more mental vigor, arising from perfect freedom of thought and action, and from their greater and more diversified knowledge.

They are better marksmen and axemen, because the gun and the axe are their playthings from childhood. They are better and bolder horsemen, because they are accustomed to the horse from their infancy, and ride as though they grew to his back. They are the best geographers, because the most universal readers and the greatest travelers in the world. No army will intrench itself so quickly as an American army, and no citizen becomes a soldier, either as dragoon, rifleman or engineer, so readily as an American, for the reason that the essential elements of his education are already implanted.

The African slave is the most indifferent in all these qualifications—no other peasant or slave is so

dull. If it were not so he would cease to be a slave. He is not useful either in offensive or defensive war; he adds nothing to our stock of knowledge; he makes no inventions; in no way does he improve the character or condition of our race.

In defensive war, the slave is a real drawback, a minus quantity; he has nothing but physical strength; he has no skill and but little devotion. To no other cause can it be ascribed, that in a southern clime, in the hottest month in the year, four thousand five hundred men—without artillery, without cavalry, without much geographical knowledge of the country, men who had for months been pent up in ships—should march for four successive days in a densely populated country, admirably adapted to defence, reach the capital of the nation, destroy its public buildings, Turk-like burn its library, and leisurely retreat and reach their ships, unmolested except in a single engagement. This deep disgrace is not to be accounted for except on the principle that one-half of the physical force of the country was a slave population, that had neither skill nor will to resist the invader; that had no rights, no liberty, no home to defend; a population that needed care and watching that abstracted from the power to defend; a population that staid at home to rob, pilfer, and steal when their masters went forth to fight.

Let no man ascribe this deep national disgrace to any want of courage or skill in the commanding-general—to any lack of courage in his troops, for they were instinctively brave.

The power of the country was paralyzed by the physical power of slavery, and the capital was lost.

Many of our citizens—a large part of the Christian world, believe slavery to be a sin. Three quarters of the people of the United States think it to be a great moral and political evil; that its existence comes in conflict with the cherished and fundamental principle of our Government, that all men are born free and equal, and of right possess certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

There is no glory in the institution—it is the glory of the strong oppressing the weak, of the wise circumventing the simple. The insecurity of property vested in slaves, the present danger—illustrated in a neighboring city of twenty thousand inhabitants, where \$21,000 are annually paid for a civic guard; the fear of insurrection, of the reënactment of the scenes of St. Domingo; the present poverty and weakness which slavery invariably brings, would seem to prove that there was neither happiness or glory connected with the institution; it is the happiness of sleeping in a



magazine—on the crater of a volcano. It does not bring strength or glory; it does not promote the cause of science; it does not stimulate men to make useful inventions; it does not enhance the value of land; it does not promote industry—it makes men despise it; it does not soften or sweeten the dispositions of men; and it has in its very nature and in its increase, a fearful looking for of judgment to come.

To illustrate by an example: The area of Virginia is sixty-one thousand three hundred and fifty-two square miles. The area of New York is forty-six thousand. If the States of Vermont and Massachusetts were added to New York, their joint area would be seventy-two square miles *less* than that of Virginia alone. The soil of Virginia is naturally as fertile as that of New York, her resources of the forest as great, her mineral resources at least equal, her fisheries vastly more valuable, her hydraulic power as great, her position for commerce and her natural channels of commerce better, her climate is immeasurably superior.

In 1790, the population of Virginia was 748,308, of which 203,427 were slaves. The population of New York 340,120, of which 21,324 were slaves. Virginia had 226,085 more white inhabitants than New York, and 182,103 more slaves. In short, Virginia, in 1790, had 408,188 more inhabitants than New York.

In New York, the number of slaves gradually diminished till 1820, when slavery became extinct.

In Virginia, slaves rapidly increased till in 1840, they numbered 448,987, and her white population numbered 790,510. In all, bond and free, 1,239,797; while the free white population of New York had increased to 2,428,921—a difference in the increase of the whole number of 1,597,312, and a difference in the increase of free white inhabitants of 1,864,191 in fifty years.

In that period Virginia has made 381 miles of railroad; New York about 1,000. Virginia has made about 182 miles of canal; New York about 750 miles.

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| The school fund of New York is .....  | \$6,491,803 |
| That of Virginia.....   | 1,488,261   |
| The productive public property of New York is..                             | 39,138,992  |
| The productive public property of Virginia is.....                          | 6,107,364   |
| The domestic produce exported by New York in 1848 amounted to .....         | 38,771,209  |
| The domestic produce exported by Virginia in the same year amounted to..... | 3,679,948   |
| New York exported of foreign produce.....                                   | 14,579,948  |
| Virginia exported of foreign produce.....                                   | 1,554       |

Virginia, the mother of Presidents, the Old Dominion, larger and of greater natural capacity than New York, Vermont, and Massachusetts,

combined, exported in the year of grace 1848 to the amazing amount of \$1,554—about in the ratio of 100 to 1,000,000.

The registered and enrolled tonnage of Virginia, in 1848, was 128,364 tons; that of New York 845,742 tons—717,378 tons difference. The State of New York paid to this Government for postage in the year ending June 30, 1849, \$694,532 81. The State of Virginia paid in the same year for postage \$109,301 93. The transportation of the mail in New York cost the Government in the same year \$238,530; in Virginia, \$166,130. New York pays in postage \$456,002 *more* than it costs to transport the mail in that State. Virginia pays in postage \$56,833 *less* than it costs to transport the mail in Virginia—a difference between these two States of \$512,835 in one year. Virginia does not pay for the transportation of the mail within \$56,832. There are but three slave States—Delaware, Missouri, and Louisiana—that do pay their own postage. It costs this Government to transport the mail in the slave States \$519,438 15 more than those States pay in postage. There are twelve States in this Union from which bounty lands have been distributed for services in the Mexican war—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Alabama, Iowa, Mississippi, Louisiana, Michigan, Arkansas, Wisconsin, and Florida. Six of these States are free, six slaveholding. The area of the six slaveholding States is 323,146, that of the six free States is 290,259 square miles—32,887 square miles more in the six slave, than in the six free States. These six slave States have a better climate, are better located, are as fertile, and have greater natural advantages than the six free States.

There have been located in those States for military services in the Mexican war up to March 28, 1850, 41,780 land warrants, of which 34,434 have been located in the six free, and only 7,346 in the slave States—about six to one. The soldier who locates his land with a view of being a freeholder, and having a farm and a home, the speculator who buys to sell again, rush, full gallop, to the free States, they flee from the slave States as they would from the cholera.

I select this period for the reason that a very large share of those who have located bounty lands for services in the Mexican war, it is alleged, were from slaveholding States. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ORR] alleges that 46,000 southern men engaged in the Mexican war, and only 23,000 northern. The foreigner who seeks a home, and independence, and liberty in our Republic, does not locate in the slave States. The poor man at the South, who owns no slaves—the



discharged soldier of the South, why do they abandon their own charming climate, their fertile and cheap lands? Why do they leave the graves of their forefathers—the church where their parents were married and they baptized, and take refuge in the land of the free? Is it not because their only capital is their ability to labor, and they cannot labor among slaves without dishonor? Is this not the reason why the free States are more populous than the slave, and why land is worth more in the free than in the slave States? And is it not a reason, and a sufficient reason, why the United States should exclude slavery from territories that are free?

One great evidence of the superiority of the American Anglo-Saxon race, exists in their useful inventions—their labor-saving machines. The great object of attraction in this city is the Patent Office; there are congregated and displayed the inventions of the most ingenious race the sun ever shone on—inventions, without the aid of which we could now hardly live. At vast expense you have adorned the grounds around this Capitol with columns and statuary. You have decorated your walls with paintings. These are no solace to the mighty dead whose great deeds they commemorate; they hardly quicken the patriotism of the living. Without expense to you, as quietly and as silently as the insect in the deep ocean raises its coral reef, a vast building is filled with models of inventions, now indispensable to man. There is the iron plough, the first implement in agriculture; there is the lathe, that turns lasts, and gunstocks, and axhelves, and performs curious operations in statuary; there is the steam-engine, applied to the moving of ships—father to the locomotive on the railroad; there is the cotton-gin, that adds one-half to the value of the cotton crop; there is the machine that sends messages, speeches, intelligence, with lightning speed—its motive power is lightning. Who tamed these elements? Who chained, who subdued and made them slaves? Who made them subservient to the power, and comfort, and exaltation of man? Where did these benign magicians, these benefactors of mankind, live? Not south of Mason and Dixon's line. Of the 16,340 inventions recorded in the Patent Office, 13,944 were made north, on the free side, of that line—famous in our history as was the Rubicon in the history of Rome.

In looking over a long column of useful inventions, I detected two that I thought worthy of remark. One was a tent, made of net work, for the exclusion of insects—a kind of gill-net, I suppose, for mosquitoes; and the other was an improvement in a *rat-trap*. “Necessity” is the mother of

invention, and it is needless to say that the inventor of the mosquito gill-net lived in New Orleans, and the inventor of the “*improved rat-trap*” in this city.

These statistics are introduced to show, and I think do conclusively prove, that the institution of slavery is a source of danger, weakness, and poverty; that it degrades labor and does not stimulate invention. The parallel might be drawn in the schools and churches, in the libraries, in the humane institutions; in short, in most of those institutions that unite and elevate mankind; and do, in my estimation, most conclusively show that the area of slavery cannot, must not be extended.

The gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. TOOMBS,] says that “no government can or ought to stand, that brings its power in hostility to the property of the people;” the meaning and intendment of which is, that no government can stand, or ought to stand, which brings its power into hostility to property in slaves, which the gentleman is pleased to estimate at fifteen hundred millions of dollars, which is estimating every negro, old and young, at \$500 each, in my estimation more than double what they would sell for. If a representative government is unjust, oppressive, unwise, it is a reason why our counsels should be changed, not a reason for rebellion, not a reason why the government should be destroyed. In a representative government there is no need of rebellion, for we have always the peaceable means of changing counsels. Let us examine this sword which the gentleman from Georgia brandishes with such terrific ardor: has it not two edges? will it not cut North as well as South? Property in slaves should undoubtedly be protected where it constitutionally and of right belongs—not elsewhere.

Free labor is immeasurably the greatest interest in the country; landed interest ranks next; the inventive genius of a country is of incalculable value;—slavery impairs to a great extent all these interests. The machinery and manufacturing skill of a country are wonderfully vast interests—they all deserve protection; and the apothegm of the gentleman from Georgia is as true at the North as it is at the South. But while northern property and northern interests have been forced to enact the part of the shuttlecock, between the battledoors in southern hands, slaves and slave labor *are* better protected than any other property in the world; and they pay nothing for protection, for our revenue is derived from a tariff on imported goods, which the slave neither uses or consumes.

The Berlin and Milan decrees, the continental system devised by the great Napoleon, did not protect the manufactures of continental Europe



half as effectually as slave property is protected in the United States.

We exclude all slaves from abroad, securing to the South the exclusive right to supply all slave territory with slaves, we more than double that territory to improve the market. Extend that "*free trade*" which the South contends for in most other articles of commerce, to the African slave trade, and the price of negroes would be reduced at least one-half. Then southern gentlemen would begin to see and feel and know the necessity of protection to at least one kind of domestic production, not to say industry. Property vested in slaves is not only directly protected by the total exclusion of slaves from abroad, but it is incidentally protected by the full and ample protection of every single thing which is the result of slave labor. The duty on imported rice is 20 per cent.; on sugar 30 per cent., and on tobacco 40 per cent. How happy, how prosperous, how rich would the North be, if the results of her free labor were thus protected! We also protect all these interests incidentally, by preventing other parts of the world from getting their supply of slaves from Africa. Is any one so green as to suppose that we sustain a fleet on the African coast, at the expense of a million a year, to suppress the slave trade, out of any love for the black man—out of any dislike to, or any abhorrence of the slave trade? Why, sir, southern gentlemen inform us, that the slave trade with Africa is the best kind of slave trade—that the black man is improved by being brought from Africa to America; that thus he is humanized, civilized, christianized; that he was a slave before; that by changing countries he changes a heathen for a christian master. Sir, our domestic slave trade is orthodox, because it is our doxy. The slave trade between Africa and Brazil is heterodox, because it is Brazil's doxy. Everybody knows that sugar, rice, cotton, and tobacco, are the great staples which slave labor produces; everybody also knows that every increased production of these articles, reduces their price by the well known rule of supply and demand. Brazil, it is well known, could and would, with an ample supply of slave labor, successfully compete in the production of all these staples with any other nation. It is Brazil that purchases the greater part of the negroes that are smuggled across the Atlantic from Africa, and everybody knows, that every negro that is imported into Brazil, goes to increase the quantity of rice, sugar, tobacco, and cotton, in that fertile region, and of course to reduce the price of those articles all over the world. The million of dollars which it annually costs us to suppress the slave trade on the coast of Africa, is an indi-

rect bounty on the price of the slave and the produce of his labor.

It is the practice, and apparently the pleasure of the South, continually to complain of the encroachments of the North. In no one particular is there foundation for this complaint, except in the hesitation, the reluctance of the North, to deliver up fugitive slaves. The North recognizes the constitutional obligation, regrets the existence of the cause of complaint, and avers that the Constitution and law are in full vigor to punish the offender. Still, when the fathers of the Republic characterized slavery as a great evil, moral and political—when we by our laws pronounce the dealing in slaves on the high seas and on the east side of the Atlantic ocean piracy, and punish the crime with death, it would seem that there was some apology (not a justification,) for the sentiment, and, to a certain extent, practice, of hesitating to deliver up fugitive slaves.

The existence of slavery is against the genius of our Constitution, and its toleration is an exception, not a rule. All the slaveholding territory which the framers of the Constitution contemplated, at the time of adopting the Constitution, is embraced in the States of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, containing 432,002 square miles. There have been added to that, of slave territory, over 500,000 square miles; and this addition is worth more, for any purpose of national greatness, than all the land northward of it to the pole. This added slave territory is here with its slave representation, and yet gentlemen complain of the encroachment—the *aggressions* of the North!!

I look upon the toleration of a slave representation in the territory west of the Mississippi, as a violation of the Constitution. There was nothing in the Constitution itself—nothing in the intention of its makers—that would warrant a slave representation there. I put it to the consciences of southern gentlemen to say whether the framers of the Constitution would have tolerated the idea of the enlargement, much more the doubling the area of slavery, and the yielding to that great territory a representation of goods and chattels. And on the ground of constitutionality as well as expediency, I resist the extension of the area of slavery.

The framers of the Constitution contemplated a termination of slavery; they apprehended no danger from its being "hedged in, girdled round, pent up," as gentlemen are pleased to style it. In our folly we have enlarged, more than doubled, its area; and now, gentlemen complain of encroach-



ment. Let us not hereafter criticise the wolf that, disturbing the water of the brook *up* stream, complained of the lamb who ventured 'to drink' below him.

It was not till the purchase of Louisiana and the exclusion of slaves from abroad, that the South began to doat on the institution; it is the almighty dollar which has changed the opinions of men. Slaves are now a profitable kind of stock to raise for sale, and the South have the exclusive control of this market, and the more the market is enlarged, the greater the price of the slave.

Much is said about the Missouri compromise, as though there was something more sacred and binding in that than in ordinary laws. Still, when it suited the convenience of the slave power, a tract of country larger than some States in this Union was abstracted from the territory solemnly declared to be free and added to Missouri. The South sees nothing wrong, nothing aggressive in this.

There is, in the estimation of the South, nothing wrong, nothing aggressive, when the freemen of the North are arrested and imprisoned, and sometimes sold for slaves, because it has pleased God to bestow upon them a skin not quite so white as ours.

The South does not dream that it is wrong to deny the right of legal investigation to ascertain whether her laws are constitutional or not. It is only one of her lion-like vices, that the freeman is seized and imprisoned, the laws nullified, and the messenger that is sent to inquire as to the legality of the proceedings, hustled out of the State by a mob.

Let it cease to be profitable to raise slaves, and the opinions of men would change; but it is profitable, and the extension of the area of slavery increases that profit, and out of that has grown the insatiable lust of conquest.

The deadly and expensive war with the Florida Indians, the Texas conspiracy, the annexation of that territory and the consequent war with Mexico, are all attributable to the same cause.

The slave power that had acquired Texas and Florida, had also marked New Mexico and California for its own; but "the gods sit up aloft, and laugh at the calculations of mortals." The South, by the force of circumstances, not for the want of ready wit and untiring industry, is defeated by circumstances, which southern forecast could not foresee or southern ingenuity prevent.

The South, that has added over five hundred thousand square miles to the area of slavery, charges the North with all manner of encroachments and aggressions; insists that the question

shall be settled now at the tap of the drum; insists that the North shall give bail for her future good conduct, or she will "devote all she has, and all she is," to the settlement of the question by violence, even to the division of the Union.

What else mean the expressions—first "pure *then* peaceable"—"millions for defence, not a cent for tribute"—"our fathers acquired liberty by the sword, and at every hazard we will maintain it?" Everybody knows that the existence of slavery in a Territory or State, excludes, effectually excludes all white laboring men: their ability to labor is their property, perhaps all their property. We buy, or annex, or conquer five hundred and fifty thousand square miles of territory, on some corner, some little patch of which slavery exists, a few thousand; and the whole five hundred and fifty thousand square miles of territory is declared slave territory, and every free white laboring man effectually excluded therefrom.

Southern gentlemen discover nothing wrong, nothing aggressive in this. The foreigner, the poor white man, and the discharged soldier, the land speculator, all, all shun that slaveholding territory as they would the plague; but southern gentlemen see nothing wrong in the cause or its consequences,—no matter if the white man is excluded there is more room for slaves! There are fewer candidates for office, better chance to maintain the southern oligarchy.

No matter if the price of land is degraded, the slaveholder is the chief purchaser, and the cheaper the land the better for him; but when a territory that is free, a territory that no slave's foot presses, is acquired, that must and shall be slave territory, now and at the tap of the drum, and the North must give bail that it shall remain so, or the chivalric South "will devote all she has and all she is to the division of the Union."

But, it is said we insult the South by calling slavery hard names. I have not time to enumerate what the leading men of the South say of slavery; certain it is that the North cannot have stigmatized it by harder names, from the Declaration of Independence downwards. Our statute book styles it piracy when carried on with Africa, and every year we expend large sums and sustain a fleet on the African coast to suppress it.

Have gentlemen forgotten the opinions which their great men have entertained and expressed as to this institution—the Jeffersons, Madisons, Masons, Rutledges, Pinkneys, and the father of his country, the great Washington himself? Will gentlemen, who boast of being "the sons of the Presidents," vindicate their legitimacy by denouncing, scoffing, vituperating against the sentiments



of those very Presidents whose children they claim to be?

The object of the South is manifest—she is determined to rule this nation in all time to come. She looks to future conquests as the means; hence her anxiety to touch the Rio Grande and the Gila, in all their extended length—for the slave power is as expansive as steam, and claims all it touches or points towards. The iron hand of Russia, which on the Turkish frontier eternally points toward the Bosphorus, and the equivocal inscription, "*This is the way to Constantinople*," is not more indicative of the designs of the Czar.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] speaks of the "future conquests of the South;" and the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. CLINGMAN,] who claims to exercise a controlling influence, and who seems to speak for the whole South, says that he has no doubt that after the next presidential election we shall get (he does not add, *by hook or by crook*) all that part of Mexico that lies east of Vera Cruz. The messenger of peace forgets his glad tidings, the politician his craft—both combine to get the free territory of Mexico, or to enlarge the area of slavery. "They snuff the battle afar off, and are glad." Now, for this very reason, I insist that Texas shall not touch Mexico, if we can lawfully prevent it, and that there shall be, if we can legally have it, at least a belt around that devoted Republic, known, claimed, and acknowledged to be free, a *non-conductor* of slavery.

Render unto Texas and Slavery the things that are theirs, and unto Liberty the things that are hers—and then, and not till then, will this lust of conquest be subdued. The South alleges as a cause of complaint, that the South bears more than their fair share of the taxes, and that the revenues, when collected, are dispensed almost exclusively for the benefit of the North. It is a bold assertion, unsustained by proof; and if true, and, as is alleged, the result of unequal legislation, it is *southern* legislation; for the periods when northern policy has prevailed have, "like angels visits, been few and far between." Of the sixty-one years that we have had Presidents under the Constitution, only twelve years have we had northern Presidents, and four of those twelve should not be counted, for it was a northern man with southern principles that occupied the presidential chair—the North owned the body of that President—the South the soul; and when that President dared to say that his soul was his own, the chivalry of the South "*nullified* him body and soul"—(his Democratic soul I mean.)

Our revenue is almost exclusively derived from duties on imported articles; and certainly those

that do not consume or use those articles, do not pay the duties. Over one-third of the whole population in the slave States are slaves, that use a very small amount of imported articles. I have no doubt, if the truth could be arrived at, that the people of the North use of imported articles at least a third more in proportion to their population, than the people of the South. As an example, we import every year over \$20,000,000 worth of silks, and their compounds, upon which the slave pays no tax, or his master for him; for fabrics of silk are not used by the slave. An examination of the "Blue Book" for the sixty years past, would not be a very interesting study for those who contend that the revenues of this nation have been dispensed for the benefit of the North. Why, sir, in presidential salaries alone, the South has a million of dollars the advantage of the North. Do the South, when they make this charge, remember the Florida war and its expenses?—a war waged exclusively for the benefit of the South. Do the South remember the millions we have paid for the removal of the Indians, and expenses connected with their removal—removals rendered necessary by the proximity of slavery? The South involved us in the Mexican war. For what purpose was that war waged?—to advance whose interests were the untold millions of money that it cost expended?

But, say the gentlemen from the South, "You pen us up; you girdle us round with free territory." The South, that has more than doubled the area of slavery, which neither the North or the South expected was to be extended—the South, which has added over five hundred thousand square miles to the area of slave territory, worth more than all that lies north of it, all the way to the pole—talk of being *girdled* around and pent up, restricted and restrained in its boundaries!—really, the demands of the South are insatiable—her tax on our credulity beyond endurance.

But, say the South, "The immense territory 'which is already yielded to slavery, will, after a time, be insufficient for the subsistence of its inhabitants, and they must perish for want, or from collisions between the races.' That in twenty-five years the slaves will number seven or eight millions, and in fifty years about fifteen millions. That is, the slaves double in twenty-five years. Thus reasons the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. CLINGMAN.] Let us follow out this reasoning. Fifteen millions in A. D. 1900, thirty millions in 1925, and sixty millions in 1950. According to the reasoning of the gentleman, there will be a population of sixty millions of these black men, that have not yet arrived at the dignity of barbarism—beings who, according to the opinion of states-



men in the other wing of this Capitol, are the connecting-link between man and the brute—men who never have, and never will be able to take care of themselves—and now it is said that all forecast must cease; and we must shut our eyes on this inevitable, this overshadowing evil.

It is admitted, then, that slavery *may become* a great and overshadowing evil; “that in time the ‘vast and fertile territory which has been yielded ‘to it will be insufficient for its subsistence; that ‘the slave and his master must ultimately perish ‘from want or collision between the races.” Precious confession! And the panacea for this great plague is to extend the disease, to inoculate for the cholera.

Would it be a wise father who should say to his sons, Our old farm, by the use of foul seed and slack farming, is at least one-third covered with tares and Canada thistles; there is danger that these noxious weeds will in a few years choke out all the salutary plants; but we have a new farm—a virgin soil—where a tare, or a thistle, or a tory weed, or a beggar’s louse, does not grow: come, let us transplant our noxious weeds there?

If I were one of that old gentleman’s sons I shou’d advise him to keep his Canada thistles at home, on his old farm. Man’s is an ephemeral existence, but a nation never dies, and our hope and trust and prayer is, that our Republic and her union may be perpetual. But if it be, as gentlemen aver, that slavery will in a few years become a great curse, an overshadowing evil, its extension into the territories of California and New Mexico will only *delay* its final denouement; it is only a question of time.

Is it statesmanlike, is it patriotic, is it humane, to sow the seeds of ruin on territories now free, not to cure, to alleviate, and only *temporarily* to alleviate our present calamity? Cannot the wise, the learned, the patriotic, the chivalrous South prescribe some other mode of avoiding the impending danger? The evil, if an evil, is hers, and to her alone it belongs to devise the remedy. A dissolution of the Union will not effect the cure, for in that event she would hardly force slavery on the new territories, and in her attempt to conquer Cuba or Mexico she might find a lion in her way!

But it is said that the removal of slaves into the new territories does not increase their number; and a statesman distinguished for the brevity of his “letter to the Chicago Convention,” a statesman unhappy in that “noise and confusion” which prevented him from informing the good people of Cleveland how devoted he was to the improvement of western rivers and harbors, says in his “*Nicholson letter*,” that it does not *increase* the number

of slaves to remove them from their present abode. It is also equally true, that the removal of trees from the nursery does not increase the number of trees; but if the question should be propounded to that learned statesman, whether the setting the said trees at suitable distances in a fertile soil would not mightily increase the quantity of fruit, the noise and confusion would, I fear, prevent our hearing a satisfactory answer. We are told that it is all a quarrel about goat’s wool; that slavery cannot extend to New Mexico and California; that all nature forbids it, and that it is only to save the point of honor that the South resists the exclusion of slavery from those territories. That is, the South is so attached to the *honor* of introducing slaves into those territories, though she never expects to carry a slave there, that she will block the wheels of Government if we *attempt* to exclude slavery, and divide the Union if we succeed! Divide the Union on a useless, senseless point of honor! Southern honor and southern profit have usually cantered together. This portion of the argument is no doubt intended for those who think that sordid calculations, the love of money and office, have no influence on the high-toned chivalric aristocracy of the South—“the sons of the Presidents.”

If it be all a question about goat’s wool, why did our wise forefathers, who all looked upon slavery as a great moral and political evil, exclude slavery north of the Ohio? Why did the South contend, as for life, that Missouri should be a slave State? If it be all a quarrel about goat’s wool, why is it that Missouri has nearly one hundred thousand slaves? Missouri is north of the compromise line, and far north of almost all the territory of California and New Mexico. If it be all a quarrel about goat’s wool, why is it that the great statesman of South Carolina, whose death the whole nation mourns, complains of the act of 1787 as an act of aggression?

But the witnesses are inconsistent. The gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. CLINGMAN,] who claims to exert a controlling influence in this whole matter, says that, except for anti-slavery agitation, “southern slaveholders would have ‘carried their negroes into the mines of California ‘in such numbers that they would have made that ‘territory a slave State.” In which event, the slaveholder would have had all the gold digging to himself; for no decent white man will dig even gold by the side of a slave.

The vices of the North are garnered up and presented to us as the necessary result of our free institutions; and it is alleged that even the diffusion of literature extends vice; that our vices are of a low order, and that we at the North are a kind



of petty-larceny race of rascals; and we are called robbers, and pirates, and all manner of hard names, while the lordly, the chivalric South, have only such vices as properly belong to "sons of the Presidents." Their vices, say they, are not the vices of the reptile; their vices partake of the character of the lion, which beast—southern gentlemen will permit me to extend the parallel—has the rare talent of lashing himself into a great rage with his own tail. Alas! there are vices, and follies, and pauperism enough at the North, but I never before heard them ascribed to our schools and our free institutions. It is a great slander upon the North—it is a poisoned arrow wantonly twanged from the bow of ignorance and prejudice, to wound the cause of freedom. The people of the North are as virtuous, as free from pauperism and crime, as any people on the face of the globe. They have some humble, some plebeian virtues, they usually pay their individual debts, and they have not, as yet, adopted the lordly, lion-like vice of repudiating their debts as States.

The foreign emigration is immense. As a general rule, the emigrant is poor. He is often ignorant, and it is sometimes the case that paupers and felons are thrust on our shores; the more destitute and vicious usually linger near the place of landing—they are too poor to remove. Is it generous, is it just, to ascribe this pauperism and vice to our schools, to our freedom from slavery?

Do southern gentlemen recommend the introduction of slavery to cure this vice and pauperism? to discard our system of universal education, and ingraft slavery in its room? But, sir, I do not admit, I do not believe that there is more pauperism and vice at the North than at the South. Give us the statistics, and let it be of the crimes *committed*, not of those punished, alone. *We*, have one code of laws; the South have four under which she inflicts punishment. She only records those which are punished under the code of statute and common law, common to us both. There is the code of honor, and there is the code of Judge Lynch, and there is the patriarchal code, by virtue of which the master inflicts punishment on his slaves. One-third of the whole population of the South, when it perpetrates crimes of a low order, is only punished by the master. Render a fair account of the crimes *perpetrated* and punished under all these four codes, and I think the South would gain very little by comparison with the North.

But, says the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. CLINGMAN,] we are richer and happier than the North. Happiness and security to person and property are nearly allied. The gentleman has de-

picted in melancholy colors the losses which the South every day sustains by the loss of slaves. The physical power is in ignorant hands, its interests are to some extent adverse to yours in peace and war. You have in one city of twenty thousand inhabitants, a civic guard, which costs annually \$21,000; and one of your own statesmen has said, that every alarm-bell makes every mother hug her infant closer to her bosom.

Happiness is in some degree a matter of taste. If the gentleman derives happiness from these sources, it is not for us at the North to complain. The gentleman from North Carolina avers that the people of the South are richer than at the North; which is in effect saying, that where only half the population work, and that half unwillingly and unskillfully, that great riches flow from such a source. This supposition being contrary to the laws of nature, which never lie, I withhold my credence.

In this, too, the South is inconsistent: when, a few years since, it was the pleasure of the South to inflict upon us a tariff which brought ruin to our doors, a tariff that made every foreigner laugh at his own good fortune and at our folly, the South taunted us with our wealth, our gorgeous palaces, our splendid equipages, our plate, our banking capital; we were then the merchant princes, and the cotton kings! Now, when it is the policy of the South to stock a great empire with men who have "not yet arrived to the dignity of barbarians," the note is changed, and we are instructed in the profits of slavery! The profits of slavery must be great if it can lose so great an amount annually in slaves, bear almost exclusively the burden of sustaining the Government, and still have such vast sums left. We are happy to hear that the South is rich, and out of that abundance it is to be hoped her States will pay their debts—that repudiation will cease to be one of her lion-like vices.

In this theory of the wealth of the South, the gentleman has adopted his theory, and in casting about for proof has befogged himself—he is betrayed by the glare of false science which leads to bewilder and dazzles to blind.

Everybody knows that land of equal fertility is worth twice as much in the free as in the slave States. Does not everybody know that the teams, the wagons, harness, the whole equipage of the farm, and the domestic animals, are superior at the North? that the rigor of our climate, as well as the pride of our people, compels us to build and furnish our houses more expensively? Does the gentleman reckon our banking capital, our money at interest, our shipping—ah! the shipping of which



the gentleman lugubriously complains that the South has none? Does he count our railroads, canals, and aqueducts, our institutions to alleviate the wants of the sick, the insane, the deaf and the blind? Does he count our colleges and schools, and the funds that sustain them? I venture to say that the State of New York alone has done more for the cause of universal education, more for the cause of internal improvements, than all the slave States combined. The reason is obvious: her councils are wise, patriotic, generous; her sons and daughters are industrious, and that industry is sharpened by science and genius.

What noble presents! what munificent donations has the North given to the South! Your cotton would have been almost valueless, except for the invention of my countryman, Whitney; and I will not stop to complain how poorly the South paid him for his invention, always excepting the good old North State, so ably represented by the gentleman upon my right, the gallant STANLY, the Bayard of the South, the intrepid statesman, who rises above sectional partialities—his State always does its duty. Your noble rivers have derived more than three-quarters of their value from the invention of Fulton, and that invention was father to the locomotive on the railroad. Your houses are preserved from lightning by the invention of Franklin—*Cælo eripuitque fulmen sceptrumque tyrannis*.

The South aided in wresting the sceptre from the tyrant. To the North alone belongs the glory of wresting from Jupiter his bolt. To the North the South owes the first and best implement of agriculture—the iron plow. Why, sir, old Virginia would have done all her thrashing with the flail, and would have struck fire with flint, steel, and tinderbox to the end of time, except for northern ingenuity. What offerings, what inventions does the South bring in return? Multitudes of abstractions! It is predicted that a certain southern State will die of an abstraction. The wild sage and the gloomy artemisia are not more indigenous on the barren sands of the West, the deserta Americana, than are abstractions in the sunny South.

She invents a bank; and when our people have thereby a good currency, and the stock is above par, she invents that the bank is unconstitutional, and ruins the hopes and fortunes of thousands. She invents an embargo, destroys all our commerce, and not long after invents that restrictions on commerce are unconstitutional. She invents a tariff for protection, invents minimum duties, and then invents that the tariff is unconstitutional, and invents the doctrine of nullification to get rid of her own invention. She invents the doctrine that one

of the greatest curses inflicted upon us by the mother country was the introduction of slaves. Again she invents that it is about the most profitable and praiseworthy business the sun ever shown on. She would peril "life, fortune, and sacred honor" to put down slavery in 1777; in the year of grace 1850, she will "devote all she has and all she is" in the cause of slavery.

These are the gifts of the South! These her jewels! She requires to make only one more invention, and that is, that in a representative Government a minority shall rule! And that invention is already begun.

The South continually complains of the gains that the North make out of southern commerce, and rates it at many millions annually. This seems to me the most childish complaint that ever was invented. The commerce between the North and South is free, and mutually advantageous. If the South wishes to transport our produce or her own, she is at liberty to do so, but she must work as well and as cheap as we do; she is at liberty to build ships and man them; she can be her own agent, and shipper, and factor. She need not employ us; she would not if it were not for her interest, and in the event of a division she would still follow her own interests, and employ those who would work the cheapest and the best.

Do gentlemen begrudge us the reward of honest industry? Is not the laborer worthy of his hire? Do you want to muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn? You may at the South, but at the North you must pay the man that works for you, no matter whether white or black.

If the labor at the South were done by free white men, labor would be honorable, your workmen would be ingenious, enterprising. You would be obliged to pay them only for their labor. You now have to pay for the labor and for the disgrace of working!

The amount of the whole matter is, one half of the physical force of the South exists in an inferior race, and that race crushed down by the impress of slavery; it is the black man's only heritage, and has been for thousands of years, and you wonder why he don't build ships and man them. You are amazed that a country where all are free, all educated, all emulous and enterprising, all stimulated by the brightest hopes, and often cheered on by the highest rewards, should outstrip a nation where the laborer is a slave! Knowledge is better than strength, and hence the horse receives the bit and we ride. Causes will have their effect; even the South, with all her abstractions, cannot circumvent God.

The South draws a comparison between the



state of society at the South and North, always to the advantage of the South. Forbearing to discuss the elements of "good society," or the propriety of various tastes, I am content to say that in the selection of his house or its furniture, his horses and his coach, the taste of the North and the South is much the same. We are both pleased with the same architecture, statuary, and painting; we both gaze with similar delight on the same landscape, and we are both alike enchanted by the concord of sweet sounds; but when we determine who shall till our fields, minister to our personal wants, who shall be the companions and nurses of our children, we are as wide apart as the poles.

The rude attacks on the North seemed to deserve a reply. I have replied plainly, directly—the short time allowed excludes all circumlocution, all softening of ideas by the drapery of language.

The land of my birth, and her institutions, and character, have been needlessly, wantonly assailed. Our common hope, and strength, and glory, have been attacked, and the language of disunion and treason are familiar as household words—at a time, too, when liberty looks to our united country as her only refuge. I have examined faithfully the rights and the interests of both sections of the country, and have come to the conclusion that all the territory of the United States *is*, and of right ought to remain, *free*!

I am particularly glad that California is here with her constitution, claiming rights that are secured to her by treaty, and am at all times ready to welcome her to our Union without the abridgment of an acre of her extended boundaries. This conclusion is drawn from the preceding remarks, which, briefly summed up, amount to this: That slavery is a violation of that great and fundamental principle of liberty—equality of rights; that it brings reproach on us as a nation; that it reduces the price of land; that it renders it impossible for education to be universally diffused even amongst the whites; that it is the dearest and worst labor in the world; that political power is predicated on it; that it impairs national strength; that it begets an inordinate lust of conquest. Who does not know that the late administration involved us in the war with Mexico, needlessly, wantonly, unconstitutionally, and that its object was to enhance the value of slaves and to increase the political power of the South? That to accomplish this object nearly two hundred millions of dollars have been expended: on that black altar we have sacrificed thirty thousand lives. For that cause the Lincolns, the Websters, the Clays, the McKees, the Kirbys, the Worths, the Butlers, the future hopes of the country, its pride and its prop, have

laid down their lives. To cap the climax of our punishment, when the war is ended, when the battle is fought and the victory won, we are here in angry debate threatening the dissolution of the Union—the division of that empire we have sacrificed so much to enlarge.

Alas, what madness has seized us! and are we made mad preparatory to destruction? I trust not. I have confidence in the strength of our Government to carry us through this trial. There is a providence, a fate, in the affairs of men and nations. It is an omen and a reality in our favor that in these troublous times we have in our Chief Magistrate a great and a good man, not less distinguished for his civic virtues than his military renown—firm as a rock, the bravest of the brave, his great heart entertains no sectional partialities. I trust in the intelligence and virtue of those who sent us here, and above all, as did our *Whig* ancestors, we hope in God. How can we divide? Where? For what purpose? Our past sufferings and glories, our present interests and future hopes, are all inextricably intertwined.

Let us leave this scene of excitement, and warm our patriotism by passing in review our pictorial history which adorns these walls.

The painter has displayed the triumph of science in the discovery of the better half of the world! Columbus is landing, and his devoted followers are kneeling, kissing their new discovered mother, Earth.

The Pilgrims are embarking! That brave little band have abandoned home, and friends, and country. They seek freedom, civil and religious, on a distant and inhospitable shore. See how they appeal to the ever-living God for his blessing! Little did they dream of the future greatness of the empire they were about to found. Virginia, in all her youth and beauty, is teaching the religion of peace to the red man; the lovely Indian maiden is baptized. Little did Virginia then anticipate that she should become the centre of a great empire—the sun around which thirty planets should revolve in heavenly harmony, and admit that she was, and of right ought to be, the mother of Presidents.

Our wise forefathers are deliberating about a separation from the mother country, because, amongst other wrongs, she has inflicted the curse of slavery on them.

The faithful painter has sketched a scene that, in reality or fancy, had never before met the eye—an event which finds no parallel in historic lore—two British armies have surrendered to the young Republic!

Behold the closing scene. The representatives of the old thirteen States are convened—the great



Washington is there! He is about to surrender that sword which had guided our armies to victory, our country to independence. He is about to vindicate to all the world, that it was for the country, not for himself—for the cause of liberty—he drew that sword. That achieved, his authority and its emblems are again in the hands of the people. Illustrious Southerner! the world is filled with thy renown. May we adopt thy advice and profit by thy example!

Can we divide these glories? Can we find it in our hearts to chill the glow of patriotism they inspire? We may rend these emblems, but the glory will remain one and indivisible.

There is still another space—there is room for another picture. Shall that niche be filled with the likenesses of those who plotted the dismemberment of this great Republic?—the destruction of a Government the most just, to which the eyes of all the sons of freedom instinctively turn as to the rock of their salvation? Shall we see in that space the likenesses of the monomaniacs who, in hot

pursuit of one solitary idea, rush furiously over a communion table?—fanatics who stigmatize our glorious Constitution as “a covenant with death, and league with hell”?—false saints who would, were it possible, deceive even the elect?—disappointed politicians, who love treason for treason’s sake, and are disunionists “*per se*”?—amateur politicians, who talk treason they do not mean, trifle with holy things, and only speak for “Buncombe?” Fit forerunners of the Nashville Convention!

The decision of the question of disunion is not with us. There is a virtuous, a conservative, a united, a happy people behind this scene, with

“—hearts resolved and hands prepared,  
The blessings they enjoy to guard”—

the sovereign people, whose veto is conclusive. It is the voice of the people that rings from ocean to ocean, and echoes back from mountain to mountain, No division! no disunion! And the voice of that people is the voice of God.